

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
MAY 14, 2014**

**CALL TO
ORDER
(6:01 pm)**

A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Board members present were Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Tim Calaway, Noah Bodman, Gene Shellerud, Jim Heim, Jeff Larsen and Greg Stevens. Ron Schlegel had an excused absence. BJ Grieve, Alex Hogle and Erik Mack represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were 25 people in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES
(6:02 pm)**

Heim made a motion, seconded by Larsen to approve the April 9, 2014 meeting minutes and April 9, 2014 workshop minutes.

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT
(not related to
agenda items)
(6:03 pm)**

None.

**LINDSEY
BENGTSON
(FCMU 14-01)
(6:03 pm)**

A request by Lindsey Bengtson for a Major Land Use Review for 'Guest Cabins'. The proposal is to construct five (5) rental cabins on the 10-acre subject property within the Middle Canyon Region of the Canyon Area Land Use Regulatory System (C.A.L.U.R.S). The property is located at 2655 Old Highway 2 East.

STAFF REPORT

Hogle reviewed Staff Report FCMU 14-01 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Larsen and Hogle discussed if the signage for the property met requirements and the condition which addressed signage. They also discussed what was required for a site plan for applications, what had been submitted with this application and what had been conditioned concerning the site plan.

Heim pointed out a typographic error in Condition #6 and Hogle read what was appropriate which was 'the proposed *guest cabins* shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan and materials submitted except as modified by the conditions.'

Callaway and Bengtson discussed how the shape of the lot came

to be, if the property's use was agricultural and the total of the original acreage.

Shellerud and Hogle discussed if a minimum distance between cabins had been considered and why it had not been conditioned.

Bodman and Hogle discussed if there were dimensional requirements and what they were.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Lindsey Bengston, 2677 Old Highway 2 E, said there was a need for additional housing for tourists in the area.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

The board and Bengston discussed if she lived on the property and if the rentals would be year round or seasonal.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed the board had read the written public comment.

Syd Kincade Park, 1155 Belton Stage Road, had concerns about septic requirements.

Larsen addressed Park's dwelling units and septic requirements concern.

Sharon Deemeester, 130 Glacier Ridge Drive, voiced her concern over the view shed and septic.

Bernita Reinhard, 161 1st Avenue, West Glacier, was against the application.

Darlene Wagner, 104 1st Avenue, West Glacier, was against the application.

Don Reinhard, 161 1st Avenue, West Glacier, was against the application.

Catherine Richter, 11505 Highway 2 E, West Glacier, asked if the application had been approved by the fire department.

Hogle said the local fire department had been given an agency referral letter and had not commented.

Hickey-AuClaire and Hogle explained what review was done for the application.

Richter said if there was a fire at the property it could be allowed to start a forest fire.

Hogle said it depended on the capabilities of the fire department.

Hogle, Hickey-AuClaire and Richter discussed if approval from the fire department was necessary for the application to be approved.

Stevens and Hogle discussed if any residence or business in the CALURS area had approval from the fire department to be in existence.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

Bengston addressed the septic and well concerns raised during public comment. She was not planning to take down any more trees, the existing structure would be removed, the fire department had been notified and had no issue and the clustering of the houses was due to regulations concerning a land use change.

Heim and Bengston discussed how many gallons per minute were needed for the cabins. Bengston said she was going to drill a new well.

Callaway said the minimum water flow for a single house was 3 gallons per house.

Bengston reiterated what was being done for well and septic for a member of the public who asked her to repeat her comments.

Callaway and Bengston discussed if she would be willing to put in an underground tank for fire suppression.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FCMU 14-01)**

Stevens made a motion seconded by Heim to adopt staff report FCMU 14-01 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Stevens, Larsen and Calaway discussed the concern of wells downhill of the proposed drain field and if the issues could be addressed by DEQ.

Larsen said there were good comments and addressed the comment which stated zoning would protect what was in existence. The land use change met all the requirements. Zoning protected both ways.

Callaway's only concern was adequate water if a fire broke out. If the fire department had nothing negative to say, he had to go along with that.

Hogle and Calaway discussed if a department did not reply to an agency referral if that meant they did not have an issue with the application.

Bodman said there were a fair number of dwellings which had some risk of fire. He agreed with the concern, but was unwilling to jump onboard to say they needed fire suppression.

The board discussed other applications where a recharge had been required and the pros and cons of having a tank on the property.

Hickey-AuClaire's only concern was the typo on condition #6.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FCMU 14-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FCMU 14-01)**

Calaway made a motion seconded by Bodman to adopt Staff Report FCMU 14-01 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO
(Amend
CONDITION #6)**

Bodman made a motion seconded by Stevens to amend Condition #6 to read:

6. The proposed ~~RV park expansion~~ *guest cabins* shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan and materials submitted with this application and on file in the Flathead County Planning and Zoning Office, except as modified by

the conditions approved by the Flathead County Board of Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Calaway asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
(Amend
CONDITION #6)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
(FCMU 14-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Hickey-AuClaire reviewed the process the application would follow from this point.

**RUTH HORN
(FZC 14-01)
6:54 pm**

A Zone Change request in the Highway 93 North Zoning District by Ruth E. Horn. The proposal would change the zoning on approximately 37.5 acres from AG-40 (Agricultural) to SAG-10 (Suburban Agricultural). The property is located off Spring Prairie Road.

Larsen recused himself from consideration of the application.

STAFF REPORT

Mack reviewed Staff Report FZC 14-01 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Russell Crowder, 2868 Lower Lost Prairie Road, was there for the applicant to answer any questions. They agreed with the findings and hoped the board would approve the application. He thought the important thing was the request allowed for similar uses to surrounding property.

BOARD

Calaway and Crowder discussed zoning around the property and

QUESTIONS	what was located in the area.
AGENCY COMMENTS	None.
PUBLIC COMMENT	<p><u>Karen Hunt</u>, 238 Moraine Drive, was against the application.</p> <p><u>Ann Zavedill</u>, 251 Moraine Drive, was against the application.</p> <p><u>Sharon Deemeester</u>, 415 Chestnut Drive, was against the application.</p>
APPLICANT REBUTTAL	Crowder addressed the concerns with water and sewer which needed DEQ approval and the esthetics of the area. He said Flathead County was not regulated by Idaho zoning regulations which had been mentioned during public comment. He also said there were more obtrusive conditional uses allowed under AG-40 which were not allowed under SAG-10.
STAFF REBUTTAL	None.
MAIN MOTION TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FZC 14-01)	Heim made a motion seconded by Shellerud to adopt staff report FZC 14-01 as findings-of-fact.
BOARD DISCUSSION	<p>Heim said before anything could happen on the property, they would have to go through subdivision review which was a whole new set of requirements which had to be met. This was setting the property up to allow subdivision.</p> <p>Calaway understood the concerns with privacy voiced by one of the public during public comment. If the property was subdivided, she would be able to purchase a lot and help maintain her privacy. He offered ways she could purchase the property.</p> <p>Stevens said what they were talking about was a zone change, which to him was appropriate. If it came to subdivision, then the concerns about the aquifer would be addressed during review. The board was not able to address the issues during a zone change. There would only be three dwelling units on the property. He did not see how that would greatly change the character of the land. There was not a way to make a living off of</p>

forty acres with traditional agricultural methods. He did not agree with zoning being a contract with purchasers, it was government policy which was subject to change. He felt this change was appropriate.

Shellerud, Mack and Grieve discussed if the application coordinated with a future land use map in the Growth Policy and process.

Bodman was not generally in favor of the slow chipping away of agricultural land to become more residential. That said, he was familiar with the property and the change would be in keeping with what was located in the area. He didn't think SAG-10 was out of character for the area.

Heim reviewed some of the conditional uses for AG-20 which would be prohibited under SAG-10 zoning.

Stevens said if anyone wanted to see the effects of a pig lot, he gave the general area of a local lot and a summarization of the undesirable results of the use.

Shellerud thought it was a good use for the area and in keeping with the smaller lots across the road.

Calaway and Shellerud briefly discussed the size of the original lot and the possibility of additional lots coming back through the board for smaller sizes.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC 14-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FZC 14-01)**

Calaway made a motion seconded by Shellerud to adopt Staff Report FZC 14-01 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Heim felt the application was a good idea.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

APPROVAL
(FZC 14-01)

BOARD
DISCUSSION

Hickey-AuClaire reviewed the process the application would follow from this point on.

MARK OWENS
(FZC 14-02)
7:23 pm

A Zone Change request in the Airport West Zoning District by Mark Owens. The proposal would change the zoning on approximately 19.386 acres from AG-20 (Agricultural) to SAG-5 (Suburban Agricultural). The property is located at 715 Birch Grove.

STAFF REPORT

Mack reviewed Staff Report FZC 14-02 for the Board.

BOARD
QUESTIONS

Heim and Mack discussed the comment from the Glacier Park International Airport (GPI) which involved the 100 to 1 slope and what GPI owned.

Grieve added additional thoughts concerning the GPI comment recommending denial of the zone change which included if the property was the appropriate place to put allowed uses with SAG-5.

Shellerud and Grieve discussed if the property was in 'the clear zone' at the end of the runway, what the 100 to 1 slope at the end of the runway was and how it applied to the application.

APPLICANT
PRESENTATION

Tom Sands, 2 Village Loop, was presenting for Eric Mulcahy for the applicant. He gave a history of how the application came to be and where the property was located. He was not here to argue with GPI and the zone change seemed to be reasonable to him. The applicant wanted to give a piece of his property to his son.

BOARD
QUESTIONS

Stevens and Sands discussed the 100 to 1 ratio brought up by Grieve and how it related to the property. They also discussed how rapidly airplanes gained altitude.

Sands and Heim discussed the length Owens had lived at the property which was 10 years.

Galen Owens explained the reason for the application which was for him to own 5 acres to build a home on property he grew up on.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed the board had read the written comment.

No public spoke.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

Grieve offered clarification on how the 100 to 1 slope issue related to the application which was to facilitate careful consideration of the comment. He displayed the nearest point of the runway to the nearest point on Owens property and the measurement which was approximately 31'.

The board discussed how long the existing runway had been in existence and how the actual height of the planes ascension affected the zone change. They also talked about placing a condition of having no buildings over 30' if the property came in for subdivision and if the board had power over the 100 to 1 slope which was federal regulation.

Stevens said if GPI and the FAA wanted to have a zone change or subdivision denied, then they should have a representative come to the meeting so the board could ask them questions. The fact they did not show up irritated him.

The board agreed with Stevens as to the benefit of having a representative present at the meeting.

Grieve thanked the board for their careful consideration of the comment from GPI.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FZC 14-02)**

Larsen made a motion seconded by Heim to adopt staff report FZC 14-02 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Stevens said this application was similar to the previous application. The zone change only allowed for two houses in the area instead of one. It was not a significant impact on air traffic.

Calaway said there would be no impact.

Bodman said he didn't have significant concerns about the airport. He recounted living in Colorado when Denver International Airport (DIA) was redone. The airport was specifically positioned to avoid noise and nuisance concerns. Developers built along the road to DIA and DIA was subsequently sued by the people who moved in for noise and nuisance. His more significant concern was comment from Cory Walters who had talked to him. Walter's concern was increasingly dense development creeping northward where agricultural land had been. The zone change paved the way for the development to keep working its way north.

Stevens and Bodman discussed the relationship between Bodman and Walters and if Bodman needed to recuse himself because Walters had been a client of his.

Grieve reviewed for the board what had been determined by the County Attorney's office as far as the need for a board member to recuse themselves from consideration of an application.

Stevens said Bodman didn't need to recuse himself, but if it had been him, if there was any hint of impropriety, he would have recused himself.

Bodman said there was no conflict of interest at this time. He was not retained by Walters at the moment, doing any work for him nor had any expectation of doing work for him in the future.

Stevens was satisfied.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC 14-02)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 6-1 with Bodman dissenting.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FZC 14-02)**

Stevens made a motion seconded by Calaway to adopt Staff Report FZC-14-02 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Heim recounted a story of his relatives who had moved and settled in an area which was now a part of the SEATAC airport. He felt the applicant made a good decision to purchase property

at the end of a runway for an airport. He was usually sympathetic to someone who wanted to split off a part of their land to give to a family member. He had changed his mind to be supportive of this application. Because the Owens' were longtime residents of the valley and hadn't snapped up a piece of land dirt cheap to make money off of, he was more inclined to vote for the application.

Calaway said if there was a way to have his children have a part of his property, he would help them get it any way he could. He thought it was a good thing a father could do that and have that option. He would like to give Owens that option.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Calaway asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
(FZC 14-02)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 5-2 with Bodman and Shellerud dissenting.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Hickey-AuClaire reviewed the process the application would follow from this point on.

**HASKILL
CREEK
HOLDINGS, LLC
(FZC 14-03)
8:00 pm**

A Zone Change request in Haskill Basin Estates District by Haskill Creek Holdings, LLC. The proposal would change the zoning on approximately 39.61 acres from AG-20 (Agricultural) to SAG-10 (Suburban Agricultural). The property is located at 1700 East Edgewood Drive.

STAFF REPORT

Mack reviewed Staff Report FZC 14-03 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Bruce Lutz, 385 Golf Course Drive, represented the applicant. He said the property was just less than 40 acres currently zoned AG-20, which meant they could build one home on the property. SAG-10 would allow two additional homes on the property. Three total homes would be the limit on the property if the application was approved. Their intention with dealing with Haskill Creek was it would be protected by 100 foot buffer. He referred to the testing which had been done on monitoring the ground water and why they had been done. He showed where the property was located on visual aids. He said the property

had significant challenges on the subdivision of the property. They also recognized there would be no homes on the property until septic approval had been obtained. The site had a slope of an 18 foot drop across the property. He reviewed the soil types on the property, the land uses in the area currently and zoning. He felt it was a land use issue; septic suitability would be addressed in the subdivision phase. He said due to the adjoining land uses and zoning, this was an appropriate zone change.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Stevens and Lutz discussed where the delineation of the peat soil was obtained and where the access to the property was located. They also discussed who owned the property currently.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed the board had read the written comments.

Rusty Wells, 251 Haskill Basin Rd, was against the application.

Stevens and Wells discussed the slope of the property.

Dan Thompson, 22 Snowshoe Flats, was against the application.

Stevens asked Thompson how large his property was.

Hopson said it was 6 acres.

Rod Juno, 1780 E. Edgewood, was against the application.

Paul Reeb, 1800 E. Edgewood, was against the application.

Stevens and Reeb discussed if Walker Creek fed his pond.

Cathy Juno, 1780 E. Edgewood, was against the application.

Lorraine Thompson, 22 Snowshoe Flats, was against the application.

Patty Perigo, 17 Snowshoe Flats, was against the application.

Stevens asked how big Perigo's property was.

Perigo said 1 acre.

The board and Perigo discussed what the previous zoning of the property had been.

Rod Juno was recognized by Hickey-AuClaire to say they had dealt with a lot of water problems in the area over the years.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

Lutz respected what the public had to say. He found it interesting most of the people had acreage less than what they were proposing. He clarified what they planned to do with the property and the topographical map.

Bodman and Lutz discussed the slope of the property.

Stevens and Lutz discussed the slope, the wetness of the property and why one of the edges of the property was consistently wet. They also discussed non-conforming parcels within a half mile of the property and where the peat soil was located.

Stevens said it looked like a bunch of small acreage property owners would get together which have one to ten acres of property and see an opportunity to zone everyone else to higher acreage. By virtue of the fact they were the majority of property owners, they would have enough pull to change the zoning. He had seen it before where neighbors would go in and zone their neighbor's property way larger than what theirs were. The fact it was zoned AG-20 and there were so many non-conforming parcels made him question what was going on.

Lutz said the subject property had been hayed for a number of years.

Lutz and Stevens discussed what the property looked like this spring and where the water stood.

Bodman and Lutz discussed where the grade started to increase on the property, the property used to be forested, the effect of trees on how much water was present on the surface of the property and the surrounding lot sizes.

Stevens, Lutz and Larsen discussed lot sizes.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

Grieve said the staff report was a research document for the board. He pointed out the conflicting testimony and points of

view and where to address those issues if the board chose to which would be in the findings of fact. He wanted to point out the findings should reflect how the board felt about the application. The findings did not all have to be positive or negative.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Shellrud recognized Reeb.

Reeb said all the non-conforming parcels were higher so they could safely be built without water issues.

Calaway and Reeb discussed if the road acted as a dam to hold water on the property.

Bodman and Reeb discussed if the north and south sides had noticeable differences of wetness.

Larsen recognized Lorraine Thompson.

Thompson asked if the housing on the property would be for the normal family and what the price point would be.

Hickey-AuClaire said it would be difficult to say at this time. It depended on many variables which included when the property would go through subdivision.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FZC 14-03)**

Bodman made a motion seconded by Stevens to adopt staff report FZC 14-03 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Bodman said for the record he had spot zoning concerns. He thought they were alright on the issue because there were a bunch of adjacent, smaller, non-conforming, sub ten acre properties. Even though those non-conforming properties were zoned AG-20, he didn't think this particular zone change would be substantially out of character with the surrounding area.

Stevens asked staff to read the definition of spot zoning and the differences in uses from AG-20 to SAG-10 or SAG-5.

Mack read the definition for spot zoning.

Stevens discussed the differences in uses and similarities between the different uses for the zone change. The differences

in uses he felt was considered to be between commercial and residential, commercial and agricultural, industrial and residential, etc. It was not ever meant to say that almost identical uses between AG-20 and SAG-5 were to be considered spot zoning by virtue of the fact the density was a little different. He didn't see it that way. The uses were very similar.

Larsen said some of the zone changes in Evergreen went from R-1 to R-2 and he did not consider that spot zoning. He agreed with Stevens.

Shellerud and Mack discussed how much of the property was located in the floodplain.

Shellerud and Larsen discussed the design of a drainage swale with grass.

Shellerud thought the effects with grass was what was happening with the property. A one and a half percent slope would not drain the same with grass as opposed to no grass. He was unsure if they would be able to find three appropriate home sites on the property. He felt there was enough property for sale in the valley and they did not need to be messing with a sensitive area like this.

Calaway reminded the board the change was only from AG-20 to SAG-10 and the onus was on the developer to prove they were able to place houses on the property.

Shellerud said they were setting precedence that someone could take an alleged swamp and start building houses on it.

Bodman said just because it was possible doesn't mean you should do it.

Calaway said it was up to the developer. It was his property. He did not feel he could deny the applicant the right to attempt the development when the non-conforming uses around the property were way denser than the proposed change.

Bodman and Calaway discussed situations where unexpected things happened to houses such as water in the basement, the effects of a metal roof and water in the house and where the responsibility lay for the events.

Stevens said he became nervous when they discussed water and soil issues. He recounted his basement flooding when he was at a higher elevation.

Hickey-AuClaire recounted a similar experience with houses.

The board discussed if building sites needed to be determined before the zone change was granted and if precedence was being set.

Larsen said the perk tests did need to be done in the spring and options if they failed. He said there were a lot of findings which related to issues in the Growth Policy and Whitefish Master Plan. He didn't know if they wanted to address the findings or continue forward.

The board discussed which findings were positive and which were negative.

The board chose to continue.

Grieve reviewed procedure for the board.

Hickey-AuClaire and Grieve clarified procedure.

The board was polled and the members were fine with continuing.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC 14-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
DENIAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FZC 14-03)**

Shellerud made a motion seconded by Bodman to adopt Staff Report FZC 14-03 and recommend denial to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The board discussed subdivisions which had building sites identified with wet land and issues which happened with other subdivisions which had sites designed and failed perk tests. They also discussed non-conforming parcels around the property, if there would be more property which would want zone changes in the future and Growth Policy issues with sensitive

soils. They continued to discuss the option to give the applicant the right to continue if they were willing to risk capital, how many dwelling units would be on the property and clustering the dwellings. They debated if they were rewarding the lack of due diligence, if they were setting themselves up for lawsuit if they approved the application, what could have been done for members of the board to approve the application and setting a precedence.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Calaway asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
DENIAL
(FZC 14-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 4-3 with Larsen, Calaway and Stevens dissenting.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The board took a 5 minute break.

**OLD BUSINESS
9:33 pm**

Follow up discussion with Kalispell planning staff regarding Kalispell Growth Policy.

Tom Jentz had been before the board approximately one year ago discussing the Kalispell Growth Policy. He updated the board on what had been done which was updating the document itself, not maps. He spoke at length about what had been done to update the document, what the plan affected, what was included in the plan, what Kalispell's vision for the future was and what they would focus on in the future.

Calaway and Jentz discussed what would be or could be done in the future concerning West Reserve Drive and traffic.

Jentz and the board discussed projects the city had planned for roads, how density was determined, the map Jentz had brought for the board and the transportation plan which had not been adopted by the county.

Discussion on scheduling home occupations and accessory dwelling units zoning text amendments.

Grieve said the text amendments were packaged and ready. He asked if the board would consider the package at the August meeting.

The board and Grieve discussed issues which had arisen which made postponing the next text amendments until August advantageous.

The board agreed to postpone the hearing of the amendments.

Grieve said he had met with various organizations which were in favor of the amendments. There was a lot of development energy, but none had come in as applications.

The board and Grieve discussed possible reasons no applications had been received.

NEW BUSINESS
10:04 pm

Grieve said on May 21 and 22 were the RISK map management meetings. He described what would be covered at the meetings and showed the revisions for the board on the computer.

The board and Grieve discussed if the previous application could be withdrawn in the middle of deliberation.

ADJOURNMENT
10:11 pm

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:11 pm. on a motion by Bodman. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on August 13, 2014.

Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Chairman

Donna Valade, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS **SUBMITTED**/CORRECTED: 9 / 10 / 14